

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 15 and 17-19 were rejected and Claims 2, 6-7, 9, 13-14, 16 and 20-21 were objected to.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for noting allowable subject matter. In order to expedite issuance of this case, various claims have been amended or cancelled. Claims 2, 6, 7, 14, and 21, previously objected to, have been amended to independent form and are therefore believed to be allowable. Dependent claims 3-4 have been amended to depend from claim 1, claims 9-13 have been amended to depend from claim 14, and claims 16-20 have been amended to depend from claim 21. Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 5 was also amended into independent form, and is believed to be allowable, as discussed below.

Therefore, all claims except claim 5 have been amended as indicated to be allowable, or to depend from allowable claims. As such, rejections are believed to be moot, and are traversed.

Anticipation rejection

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 15, and 17-19 were rejected as anticipated by Gont *et al.* (USP 6,738,957, hereinafter “Gont”). Most of these rejections are made moot by amendment, as described above, but claim 5 was only amended to place it in independent form (and so the scope of this claim is not changed at all). Claim 5 is distinguished from Gont as below, and so this

rejection is also traversed.

Claim 5 requires, among other limitations, defining a location of a first component of the schematic definition file, and defining locations of a plurality of second components of the schematic definition file in relation to the location of the first component. This feature is described throughout the specification, with particular relation to the MASTER and SLAVE components and the relationships between them.

Nothing in Gont teaches or suggests anything similar to this claim limitation. The Office Action makes reference to Gont's col. 5, and "performing searching for each component in the project schematic netlist", but this column, nor any other part of the cited references, does not teach or suggest defining the location of a first component then defining the locations of other components in relation to it, as claimed. If the Examiner believes that Gont includes such a teaching, he is respectfully requested to specifically identify it.

Claim 5 is therefore believed to be allowable over the art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone to discuss the issue if for any reason the Examiner does not believe that all claims, as currently amended, are allowable.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicant asserts that the remaining Claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an early allowance of such Claims.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *manderson@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: 11/23/15


Matthew S. Anderson
Registration No. 39,093

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: *manderson@davismunck.com*